arXiv:1505.02744v1 [math.NT] 11 May 2015

CLUSTERS OF PRIMES WITH SQUARE-FREE TRANSLATES

ROGER C. BAKER

Department of Mathematics
Brigham Young University
Provo, UT 84602, USA

PAUL POLLACK

Department of Mathematics
University of Georgia
Athens, GA 30602, USA

Abstract. Let $\mathcal{R}$ be a finite set of integers satisfying appropriate local conditions. We show the existence of long clusters of primes p in bounded length intervals with $p-b$ squarefree for all $b \in \mathcal{R}$. Moreover, we can enforce that the primes p in our cluster satisfy any one of the following conditions: (1) p lies in a short interval $[N, N+N^{\frac{7}{12}+\varepsilon}]$, (2) p belongs to a given inhomogeneous Beatty sequence, (3) with $c \in (\frac{8}{9}, 1)$ fixed, p^c lies in a prescribed interval mod 1 of length $p^{-1+c+\varepsilon}$.

1. Introduction

In important recent work, Maynard [6] has shown that for a given integer $t \geq 2$ and sufficiently large N, there is a set $\mathcal{S}$ of t primes in $[N, 2N)$ with diameter

$$D(\mathcal{S}) := \max_{n \in \mathcal{S}} n - \min_{n \in \mathcal{S}} n \ll t^3 e^{4t}.$$

In [2], the authors adapted [6] to obtain similar results for primes in a subset $\mathcal{A}$ of $[N, 2N)$, subject to arithmetic regularity conditions on $\mathcal{A}$.

In the present paper, we impose the further condition on $\mathcal{S}$ that (for a given nonzero integer b) $p-b$ is squarefree for each p in $\mathcal{S}$. A little more generally, we treat the differences $p-b$ $(b \in \mathcal{R})$, where $\mathcal{R}$ is a *reasonable* set.

Definition. A set $\{b_1, \ldots, b_r\}$ of nonzero integers is *reasonable* if for every prime p there is an integer v, $p \nmid v$, with

$$b_\ell \not\equiv v \pmod{p^2} \quad (\ell = 1, \ldots, r).$$

A little thought shows that, if there are infinitely many primes p with $p-b_1, \ldots, p-b_r$ all squarefree, then $\{b_1, \ldots, b_r\}$ is reasonable. From now on, let $\mathcal{R}$ be a fixed reasonable set.

In order to state our general result we require some notation. We suppose that t is fixed, that N is sufficiently large (in particular, $N \geq C(t)$) and write $\mathcal{L} = \log N$,

$$D_0 = \frac{\log \mathcal{L}}{\log \log \mathcal{L}}.$$

E-mail addresses: `baker@math.byu.edu`, `pollack@uga.edu`.

We denote by $\tau(n)$ and $\tau_k(n)$ the usual divisor functions. Let ε be a sufficiently small positive number. Let

$$P(z) = \prod_{p<z} p$$

(we reserve the symbol p for primes). Let $\mathbb{P}$ denote the set of primes. Let $X(E;n)$ denote the indicator function of a set E.

For a smooth function F supported on

$$\mathcal{E}_k := \left\{ (x_1, \ldots, x_k) \in [0,1]^k : \sum_{j=1}^{k} x_j \le 1 \right\},$$

let

$$I_k(F) := \int_0^1 \cdots \int_0^1 F(t_1, \ldots, t_k)^2 \, dt_1 \ldots dt_k$$

and

$$J_k^{(m)}(F) := \int_0^1 \cdots \int_0^1 \left(\int_0^1 F(t_1, \ldots, t_k) \, dt_m \right)^2 dt_1 \ldots dt_{m-1} dt_{m+1} \ldots dt_k$$

for $m = 1, \ldots, k$. Let $\mathcal{F}_k$ denote the set of smooth functions supported on $\mathcal{E}_k$ and for which $I_k(F)$ and each $J_k^{(m)}(F)$ is positive and let

$$M_k = \sup_{F \in \mathcal{F}_k} \frac{\sum\limits_{m=1}^{k} J_k^{(m)}(F)}{I_k(F)}.$$

Definition. (i) A set $\mathcal{H}_k = \{h_1, \ldots, h_k\}$ of integers $0 \le h_1 < \cdots < h_k$, is *admissible* if for every prime p, there is an integer v_p such that $v_p \not\equiv h \pmod{p}$ for all $h \in \mathcal{H}_k$.

(ii) Let $\mathcal{H}_k = \{h_1, \ldots, h_k\}$ be admissible. Write

$$K = (r+1)k + 1, \quad P = P(K).$$

Suppose that

$$h_m \equiv 0 \pmod{P^2} \quad (m = 1, \ldots, k) \tag{1.1}$$

$$h_i - h_j + b_\ell \ne 0 \quad (i, j = 1, \ldots, k; \ell = 1, \ldots, r). \tag{1.2}$$

We say that $\mathcal{H}_k$ is *compatible with* $\mathcal{R}$.

Theorem 1. *Let $\mathcal{R}$ be a reasonable set and $\mathcal{H}_k$ an admissible set compatible with $\mathcal{R}$. Let $N \in \mathbb{N}$, $N > C_0(\mathcal{R}, \mathcal{H}_k)$. Let $\mathcal{A} \subset [N, N+M) \cap \mathbb{Z}$ where $N^{1/2}\mathcal{L}^{18k} \le M \le N$. Let θ be a constant, $0 < \theta < 3/4$. Let Y be a positive number,*

$$N^{1/4} \max(N^\theta, \mathcal{L}^{9k} M^{1/2}) \ll Y \le M. \tag{1.3}$$

Let

$$V(q) = \max_a \left| \sum_{n \equiv a \,(\mathrm{mod}\, q)} X(\mathcal{A}; n) - \frac{Y}{q} \right|.$$

Suppose that, for

$$1 \le d \le (MY^{-1})^4 \max(\mathcal{L}^{36k}, N^{4\theta} M^{-2}) \tag{1.4}$$

we have

$$\sum_{\substack{q \le N^\theta \\ (q,d)=1}} \mu^2(q) \tau_{3k}(q) V(dq) \ll Y \mathcal{L}^{-k-\varepsilon} d^{-1}. \tag{1.5}$$

Suppose there is a function $\rho(n)$ *defined on* $[N, 2N) \cap \mathbb{Z}$ *such that*

$$X(\mathbb{P}; n) \geq \rho(n) \tag{1.6}$$

for $n \in [N, 2N)$*, and positive numbers* Y_m*,*

$$Y_m = Y(b_m + o(1))\mathcal{L}^{-1} \quad (1 \leq m \leq k) \tag{1.7}$$

where

$$b_m \geq b > 0 \ \ (1 \leq m \leq k). \tag{1.8}$$

Suppose that $\rho(n) = 0$ *unless* $(n, P(N^{\theta/2})) = 1$*, and*

$$\sum_{q \leq N^\theta} \mu^2(q)\tau_{3k}(q) \max_{(a,q)=1} \left| \sum_{n \equiv a \pmod q} \rho(n) X((\mathcal{A} + h_m) \cap \mathcal{A}; n) - \frac{Y_m}{\phi(q)} \right| \ll Y\mathcal{L}^{-k-\varepsilon}. \tag{1.9}$$

Finally, suppose that

$$M_k > \frac{2t-2}{b\theta}. \tag{1.10}$$

Then there is a set $\mathcal{S}$ *of* t *primes in* $\mathcal{A}$ *such that* $p - b$ *is squarefree* $(p \in \mathcal{S}, b \in \mathcal{R})$ *and*

$$D(\mathcal{S}) \leq h_k - h_1.$$

If $Y > N^{1/2+\varepsilon}$*, the assertion of the theorem is also valid with* (1.4) *replaced by*

$$1 \leq d \leq (MY^{-1})^2 N^{2\varepsilon}. \tag{1.11}$$

Comparing Theorem 1 of [2], where there is no requirement on squarefree translates of p $(p \in \mathcal{S})$, the difference in hypotheses on $\mathcal{A}$ is that (1.5) is required only for $d = 1$ in [2].

This is a convenient point to note that

$$M_k > \log k - C_1 \tag{1.12}$$

([9, Theorem 3.9]). Here $C_1, C_2, \ldots$ are positive absolute constants. Constants implied by '$\ll$' are permitted to depend on $\mathcal{R}, \mathcal{H}_k$, and ε.

We now give three applications of Theorem 1.

Theorem 2. *Let* α *be an irrational number,* $\alpha > 1$*. Let* β *be real. Let* v *be a sufficiently large integer and* u *an integer with* $(u, v) = 1$*,*

$$\left|\alpha - \frac{u}{v}\right| < \frac{1}{v^2}.$$

There is a set $\mathcal{S}$ *of* t *primes of the form* $\lfloor \alpha n + \beta \rfloor$ *in* $[v^2, 2v^2)$ *such that* $p - b$ *is squarefree* $(p \in \mathcal{S},\ b \in \mathcal{R})$ *and*

$$D(\mathcal{S}) < \exp(C_2\, \alpha r \exp(7.743t)). \tag{1.13}$$

(We write $\lfloor \ldots \rfloor$ *for integer part and* $\{\ldots\}$ *for fractional part.)*

Theorem 3. *Let* $7/12 < \phi < 1$ *and write*

$$\psi = \begin{cases} \phi - 11/20 - \varepsilon & (7/12 < \theta < 3/5), \\ \phi - 1/2 - \varepsilon & (\phi \geq 3/5). \end{cases}$$

For all sufficiently large N*, there is a set* $\mathcal{S}$ *of* t *primes in* $\mathcal{A} = [N, N + N^\phi]$ *such that* $p - b$ *is squarefree* $(p \in \mathcal{S},\ b \in \mathcal{R})$ *and*

$$D(\mathcal{S}) < \exp\left(C_3\, r \exp\left(\frac{2t}{\psi}\right)\right).$$

Theorem 4. *Fix c in $(8/9,1)$ and real β. Let $0<\psi<(9c-8)/6$. Let*

$$\mathcal{A}=\{n\in[N,2N):\{n^c-\beta\}<N^{-1+c+\varepsilon}\}.$$

For all sufficiently large N, there is a set $\mathcal{S}$ of t primes in $\mathcal{A}$ such that $p-b$ is squarefree $(p\in\mathcal{S},\ b\in\mathcal{R})$ and

$$D(\mathcal{S})<\exp\left(C_4\,rt\exp\left(\frac{2t}{\psi}\right)\right).$$

In Theorems 3 and 4, $\mathcal{A}$ is relatively small in cardinality compared to N. There are rather few examples of this type for which $\mathcal{A}\cap(\mathcal{A}+h_m)$ has as many primes as $\mathcal{A}$ in order of magnitude, which we need for (1.9).

2. Proof of Theorem 1

Let

$$W_1=\prod_{p\le K}p^2\prod_{K<p\le D_0}p\ ,\quad R=N^{\theta/2-\varepsilon}.$$

In our proof of Theorem 1, we use weights $y_{\boldsymbol{r}}$ and $\lambda_{\boldsymbol{r}}$ defined much as in [7, 4] by: for $\boldsymbol{r}=(r_1,\dots,r_k)\in\mathbb{N}^k$, $y_{\boldsymbol{r}}=\lambda_{\boldsymbol{r}}=0$ unless

$$\left(\prod_{i=1}^k r_i,W_1\right)=1,\ \mu^2\left(\prod_{i=1}^k r_i\right)=1. \tag{2.1}$$

If (2.1) holds, we take

$$y_{\boldsymbol{r}}=F\left(\frac{\log r_1}{\log R},\dots,\frac{\log r_k}{\log R}\right) \tag{2.2}$$

where $F\in\mathcal{F}_k$ has

$$\sum_{m=1}^k J_k^{(m)}(F)>(M_k-\varepsilon)I_k(F)>\left(\frac{2t-2}{b\theta}\right)I_k(F). \tag{2.3}$$

Now $\lambda_{\boldsymbol{d}}$ is defined by

$$\lambda_{\boldsymbol{d}}=\prod_{i=1}^k\mu(d_i)d_i\sum_{\substack{\boldsymbol{r}\\ d_i\mid r_i\,\forall i}}\frac{y_{\boldsymbol{r}}}{\prod_{i=1}^k\phi(r_i)} \tag{2.4}$$

when (2.1) holds. Note that

$$\lambda_{\boldsymbol{d}}\ll\mathcal{L}^k \tag{2.5}$$

([6, (5.9)]).

We now show that there is an integer ν_0 with

$$(\nu_0+h_m,W_1)=1\quad(1\le m\le k) \tag{2.6}$$

$$p^2\nmid\nu_0+h_m-b_\ell\quad(p\le K,\ 1\le\ell\le r,\ 1\le m\le k) \tag{2.7}$$

and

$$p\nmid\nu_0+h_m-b_\ell\quad(K<p\le D_0,\ 1\le\ell\le r,\ 1\le m\le k). \tag{2.8}$$

By the Chinese remainder theorem, it suffices to specify $\nu_0\pmod{p^2}$ for $p\le K$ and $\nu_0\,(\mathrm{mod}\,p)$ for $K<p\le D_0$. We use $h_j\equiv 0\pmod{p^2}$ $(p\le K)$. The property (2.6) reduces to

$$\nu_0\not\equiv 0\pmod p\quad(p\le K) \tag{2.9}$$

and

$$\nu_0 + h_m \not\equiv 0 \pmod{p} \quad (K < p \le D_0,\ 1 \le m \le k). \tag{2.10}$$

We define $b_0 = 0$. Now (2.7), (2.8), (2.9), (2.10) can be rewritten as

$$\nu_0 \not\equiv 0 \pmod{p},\ \nu_0 \not\equiv b_\ell \pmod{p^2} \quad (p \le K, 1 \le \ell \le r), \tag{2.11}$$

$$\nu_0 + h_m - b_\ell \not\equiv 0 \ (\mathrm{mod}\, p)\ (K < p \le D_0, 0 \le \ell \le r, 1 \le m \le k). \tag{2.12}$$

For (2.11), we select ν_0 in a reduced residue class $(\mathrm{mod}\, p^2)$ not occupied by b_ℓ $(1 \le \ell \le r)$. For (2.11), we observe that ν_0 can be chosen from the $p-1$ reduced residue classes $(\mathrm{mod}\, p)$, avoiding at most $(r+1)k$ classes, since $p - 1 > (r+1)k$.

We now define weights w_n. For $n \equiv \nu_0 \ (\mathrm{mod}\, W_1)$, let

$$w_n = \left(\sum_{d_i \mid n+h_i \,\forall i} \lambda_{\boldsymbol{d}} \right)^2.$$

For other $n \in \mathbb{N}$, let $w_n = 0$. Let

$$S_1 = \sum_{\substack{N \le n < 2N \\ n \in \mathcal{A}}} w_n,$$

$$S_2(m) = \sum_{\substack{N \le n < 2N \\ n \in \mathcal{A} \cap (\mathcal{A} - h_m)}} w_n \rho(n + h_m).$$

Exactly as in the proof of [2, Proposition 1] with $q_0 = 1$, $W_2 = W_1$, we find that

$$S_1 = \frac{(1 + o(1))\phi(W_1)^k Y (\log R)^k I_k(F)}{W_1^{k+1}} \tag{2.13}$$

and

$$S_2(m) = \frac{(1 + o(1)) b_m \phi(W_1)^k Y (\log R)^{k+1} J_k^{(m)}(F)}{W_1^{k+1} \mathcal{L}} \tag{2.14}$$

as $N \to \infty$. (The value of W_1 in [2] is $\prod\limits_{p \le D_0} p$, but this does not affect the proof.)

Exactly as in [2] following the statement of Proposition 2, we derive from (2.13), (2.14), (2.3), the inequality

$$\sum_{m=1}^{k} \sum_{n \in \mathcal{A}} w_n X(\mathbb{P} \cap \mathcal{A},\ n + h_m) > (t - 1 + \varepsilon) \sum_{n \in \mathcal{A}} w_n. \tag{2.15}$$

We introduce a probability measure on $\mathcal{A}$ defined by

$$\Pr\{n\} = \frac{w_n}{S_1} \ (n \in \mathcal{A}).$$

Writing $\mathbb{E}[\cdot]$ for expectation, (2.15) becomes

$$\mathbb{E}\left[\sum_{m=1}^{k} X(\mathbb{P} \cap \mathcal{A};\ n + h_m) \right] > t - 1 + \varepsilon.$$

It is easy to deduce that

$$\Pr\left(\sum_{m=1}^{k} X(\mathbb{P} \cap \mathcal{A};\ n + h_m) \ge t \right) > \frac{\varepsilon}{k}.$$

It now suffices to show for fixed $m \in \{1, \ldots, k\}$ and $\ell \in \{1, \ldots, r\}$ that

$$\Pr(n + h_m - b_\ell \text{ is not square-free}) \ll D_0^{-1}. \tag{2.16}$$

For then there is a probability greater than $\varepsilon/2k$ that an integer n in $\mathcal{A}$ has the property that at least t of $n + h_1, \ldots, n + h_k$ are primes in $\mathcal{A}$ for which all translates $n + h_m - b_\ell$ $(1 \le m \le k,\ 1 \le \ell \le r)$ are square-free.

The upper bound

$$\sum_{\substack{N \le n < N+M \\ n \equiv \nu_0 \pmod{W_1}}} w_n^2 \ll \mathcal{L}^{19k} \frac{M}{W_1} + N^{2\theta} \tag{2.17}$$

can be proved in exactly the same way as [7, (3.10)].

Let

$$\Omega(p) = \sum \{w_n : n \in \mathcal{A},\ p^2 \mid n + h_m - b_\ell\}$$

and

$$B = (MY^{-1})^2 \max(\mathcal{L}^{18k}, N^{2\theta} M^{-1}).$$

Clearly

$$\Pr(n + h_m - b_\ell \text{ is not square-free}) \le \frac{1}{S_1} \left(\sum_{p \le B} \Omega(p) + \sum_{\substack{n \in \mathcal{A} \\ p^2 \mid n + h_m - b_\ell \text{ (some } p > B)}} w_n \right).$$

To obtain (2.16) we need only show that

$$\sum_{p \le B} \Omega(p) \ll \frac{\phi(W_1)^k Y \mathcal{L}^k}{W_1^{k+1} D_0} \tag{2.18}$$

and

$$\sum_{\substack{n \in \mathcal{A} \\ p^2 \mid n + h_m - b_\ell \ \text{(some } p > B)}} w_n \ll \frac{\phi(W_1)^k Y \mathcal{L}^k}{W_1^{k+1} D_0} \tag{2.19}$$

From (2.6)–(2.8), $\Omega(p) = 0$ for $p \le D_0$. Take $D_0 < p \le B$. We have

$$\Omega(p) = \sum_{\boldsymbol{d}, \boldsymbol{e}} \lambda_{\boldsymbol{d}} \lambda_{\boldsymbol{e}} \sum_{\substack{n \in \mathcal{A} \\ n \equiv \nu_0 \pmod{W_1} \\ n \equiv b_\ell - h_m \pmod{p^2} \\ n \equiv -h_i \pmod{[d_i, e_i]}\ \forall i}} 1. \tag{2.20}$$

Fix $\boldsymbol{d}$, $\boldsymbol{e}$ with $\lambda_{\boldsymbol{d}} \lambda_{\boldsymbol{e}} \ne 0$. The inner sum in (2.20) is empty if $(d_i, e_j) > 1$ for a pair i, j with $i \ne j$ (compare [2, §2]). The inner sum is also empty if $p \mid [d_i, e_i]$ since then

$$p \mid n + h_i - (n + h_m - b_\ell) = h_m - h_i - b_\ell$$

which is absurd, since $h_m - h_i - b_\ell$ is bounded and is nonzero by hypothesis.

We may now replace (2.20) by

$$\Omega(p) = \sideset{}{'}\sum_{\substack{\boldsymbol{d}, \boldsymbol{e} \\ (d_i, p) = (e_i, p) = 1\ \forall i}} \lambda_{\boldsymbol{d}} \lambda_{\boldsymbol{e}} \left\{ \frac{Y}{p^2 W_1 \prod_{i=1}^k [d_i, e_i]} + O\left(V\left(p^2 W_1 \prod_{i=1}^k [d_i, e_i] \right) \right) \right\}, \tag{2.21}$$

where $\sum'$ denotes a summation restricted by: $(d_i, e_j) = 1$ whenever $i \neq j$. Expanding the right-hand side of (2.21), we obtain a main term of the shape estimated in Lemma 2.5 of [8]. The argument there gives

$$\sideset{}{'}\sum_{\substack{\boldsymbol{d},\boldsymbol{e} \\ (d_i,p)=(e_i,p)=1\,\forall i}} \frac{\lambda_{\boldsymbol{d}}\lambda_{\boldsymbol{e}}}{\prod_{i=1}^{k}[d_i, e_i]} = \sideset{}{'}\sum_{\boldsymbol{d},\boldsymbol{e}} \frac{\lambda_{\boldsymbol{d}}\lambda_{\boldsymbol{e}}}{\prod_{i=1}^{k}[d_i, e_i]} + O\left(\frac{1}{p}\left(\frac{\phi(W)}{W}\mathcal{L}\right)^k\right),$$

uniformly for $p > D_0$. As already alluded to above in the discussion of S_1, the behavior of the main term here can be read out of the proof of [2, Proposition 1]. Collecting our estimates, we find that

$$\sideset{}{'}\sum_{\substack{\boldsymbol{d},\boldsymbol{e} \\ (d_i,p)=(e_i,p)=1\,\forall i}} \frac{\lambda_{\boldsymbol{d}}\lambda_{\boldsymbol{e}}}{\prod_{i=1}^{k}[d_i, e_i]} = \frac{\phi(W_1)^k}{W_1^k}(\log R)^k I_k(F)(1 + o(1)).$$

Clearly this gives

$$\sum_{D_0<p\le B} \Omega(p) \ll \frac{Y\phi(W_1)^k}{W_1^{k+1}}\mathcal{L}^k \sum_{p>D_0} p^{-2} + (\max_{\boldsymbol{d}} |\lambda_{\boldsymbol{d}}|)^2 \sum_{D_0<p\le B} \sum_{\ell \le R^2 W_1} \mu^2(\ell)\tau_{3k}(\ell)V(p^2\ell).$$

(We use (2.21) along with a bound for the number of occurrences of ℓ as $W_1 \prod_{i=1}^{k}[d_i, e_i]$.) On an application of (1.5) with $d = p^2$ satisfying (1.4), we obtain the bound (2.18).

Let $\sum\limits_{n;\,(2.22)}$ denote a summation over n with

$$N \le n < N + M,\ n \equiv \nu_0 \ (\mathrm{mod}\, W_1),\ p^2 \mid n + h_m - b_\ell \ (\text{some } p > B). \tag{2.22}$$

Cauchy's inequality gives

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{\substack{n\in\mathcal{A} \\ p^2 \mid n+h_m-b_\ell \ (\text{some } p>B)}} w_n &\le \sum_{n;\,(2.22)} w_n \\ &\le \Bigg(\sum_{n;\,(2.22)} 1\Bigg)^{1/2} \Bigg(\sum_{\substack{n\equiv\nu_0 \ (\mathrm{mod}\, W_1) \\ N\le n<N+M}} w_n^2\Bigg)^{1/2} \\ &\ll \Bigg(\sum_{B<p\le(3N)^{1/2}} \left(\frac{M}{p^2 W_1} + 1\right)\Bigg)^{1/2} \left(\frac{M^{1/2}}{W_1^{1/2}}\mathcal{L}^{19k/2} + N^\theta\right) \end{aligned}$$

(by (2.17))

$$\ll \frac{M\mathcal{L}^{19k/2}}{W_1 B^{1/2}} + \frac{N^\theta M^{1/2}}{W_1^{1/2} B^{1/2}} + \frac{M^{1/2} N^{1/4} \mathcal{L}^{19k/2}}{W_1^{1/2}} + N^{\frac{1}{4}+\theta}.$$

To complete the proof we verify (disregarding W_1) that each of these four terms is $\ll Y\mathcal{L}^{k-1/2}$. We have

$$M\mathcal{L}^{19k/2} B^{-1/2} (Y\mathcal{L}^{k-1/2})^{-1} \ll 1$$

since $B \ge \mathcal{L}^{18k}(MY^{-1})^2$. We have

$$N^\theta M^{1/2} B^{-1/2} (Y\mathcal{L}^{k-1/2})^{-1} \ll 1$$

since $B \geq (MY^{-1})^2 \; N^{2\theta} M^{-1}$. We have

$$M^{1/2} N^{1/4} \mathcal{L}^{19k/2} (Y\mathcal{L}^{k-1/2})^{-1} \ll 1$$

since $Y \gg N^{1/4}\mathcal{L}^{9k} M^{1/2}$. Finally,

$$N^{1/4+\theta} (Y\mathcal{L}^{k-1/2})^{-1} \ll 1$$

since $Y \gg N^{\theta+1/4}$. This completes the proof of the first assertion of Theorem 1.

Now suppose $Y > N^{\frac{1}{2}+\varepsilon}$. We can replace B by $B_1 := (MY^{-1})N^{\varepsilon}$ throughout, and at the last stage of the proof use the bound

$$\sum_{\substack{p^2 \mid n+h_m-b_\ell \\ (\text{some } p>B_1)}} w_n \leq w \sum_{\substack{N \leq n \leq N+M \\ p^2 \mid n+h_m-b_\ell \\ (\text{some } p>B_1)}} 1, \tag{2.23}$$

where

$$w := \max_n w_n.$$

Now

$$w = \sum_{[d_i,e_i] \mid n_1+h_i \, \forall i} \lambda_{\boldsymbol{d}} \lambda_{\boldsymbol{e}}$$

for some choice of $n_1 \leq N+M$. The number of possibilities for $d_1, e_1, \ldots, d_k, e_k$ in this sum is $\ll N^{\varepsilon/3}$. Hence (2.23) yields

$$\sum_{\substack{p^2 \mid n+h_m-b_\ell \\ (\text{some } p>B_1)}} w_n \ll N^{\varepsilon/2} \sum_{B_1 < p \leq 3N^{1/2}} \left(\frac{M}{p^2} + 1\right)$$

$$\ll \frac{N^{\varepsilon/2} M}{B_1} + N^{1/2+\varepsilon/2} \ll Y\mathcal{L}^{k-1/2}.$$

The second assertion of Theorem 1 follows from this. □

3. Proof of Theorems 2 and 3.

We begin with Theorem 3, taking $b = 1$, $\rho(n) = X(\mathbb{P}; n)$, $M = Y = N^{\phi}$, $Y_m = \int_N^{N+M} \frac{dt}{\log t}$. By results of Timofeev [11], we find that (1.9) holds with $\theta = \psi$. The range of d given by (1.4) is

$$d \ll \mathcal{L}^{36k}. \tag{3.1}$$

Now (1.5) is a consequence of the elementary bound $V(m) \ll 1$.

Turning to the construction of a compatible set $\mathcal{H}_k$, let $L = 2(k-1)r + 1$. Take the first L primes $q_1 < \cdots < q_L$ greater than L. Select $q_1' = q_1, q_2', \ldots, q_k'$ recursively from $\{q_1, \ldots, q_L\}$ in that q_j satisfies

$$Pq_j' \neq Pq_i' \pm b_\ell \quad (1 \leq i \leq j-1,\ 1 \leq \ell \leq r), \tag{3.2}$$

a choice which is possible since $L > 2(j-1)r$. Now $\mathcal{H}_k = \{Pq_1', \ldots, Pq_k'\}$ is an admissible set compatible with $\mathcal{R}$. The set $\mathcal{S}$ given by Theorem 1 satisfies

$$D(\mathcal{S}) \leq P(q_L - q_1) \ll \exp(O(kr)).$$

As for the choice of k, the condition (1.10) is satisfied when

$$k = \left\lceil \exp\left(\frac{2t}{\theta} + C_1\right) \right\rceil$$

because of (1.12). Theorem 3 follows at once.

For Theorem 2, we adapt the proof of [2, Theorem 3]. Let $\gamma = \alpha^{-1}$, $N = M = v^2$ and $\theta = \frac{2}{7} - \varepsilon$. We take

$$\mathcal{A} = \{n \in [N, 2N) : n = \lfloor \alpha m + \beta \rfloor \text{ for some } m \in \mathbb{N}\} \quad \text{and} \quad Y = \gamma N.$$

We find as in [2] that

$$\mathcal{A} = \{n \in [N, 2N) : \gamma n \in I \pmod 1\},$$

where $I = (\gamma\beta - \gamma, \gamma\beta]$. The properties that we shall enforce in constructing $h_1, \ldots, h_k$ are

(i) $h_1, \ldots, h_k$ is compatible with $\mathcal{R}$;

(ii) we have $h_m = h'_m + h$ $(1 \le m \le k)$, where $h\gamma \in (\eta - \varepsilon\gamma, \eta) \pmod 1$ and
$$-\gamma h'_m \in (\eta, \eta + \varepsilon\gamma) \pmod 1 \text{ for some real } \eta;$$

(iii) we have
$$M_k > \frac{2t-2}{0.90411\left(\frac{2}{7} - \varepsilon\right)}.$$

The condition (ii) gives us enough information to establish (1.9); here we follow [2] verbatim, using the function $\rho = \rho_1 + \rho_2 + \rho_3 - \rho_4 - \rho_5$ in [2, Lemma 18], and taking b slightly larger than 0.90411 in (1.8).

Turning to (1.5), with the range of d as in (3.1), we may deduce this bound from [2, Lemma 12] with $M = d$, $a_m = 1$ for $m = d$, $a_m = 0$ otherwise, $Q \le N^{2/7-\varepsilon}$, $K = N/d$ and $H = \mathcal{L}^{A+1}$. This requires an examination of the reduction to mixed sums in [2, Section 5].

It remains to obtain $h_1, \ldots, h_k$ satisfying (i)–(iii) above. We use the following lemma.

Lemma 1. *Let I be an interval of length ℓ, $0 < \ell < 1$. Let $x_1, \ldots, x_J$ be real and $a_1, \ldots, a_J$ positive.*

(a) *There exists z such that*
$$\#\{j \le J : x_j \in z + I \pmod 1\} \ge J\ell.$$

(b) *For any $L \in \mathbb{N}$, we have*
$$\left| \sum_{\substack{j=1 \\ x_j \in I \pmod 1}}^{J} a_j - \ell \cdot \sum_{j=1}^{J} a_j \right| \le \frac{1}{L+1} \sum_{j=1}^{J} a_j + 2 \sum_{m=1}^{L} \left(\frac{1}{L+1} + \ell \right) \left| \sum_{j=1}^{J} a_j e(m x_j) \right|.$$

Proof. We leave (a) as an exercise. We obtain (b) by a simple modification of the proof of [1], Theorem 2.1 on revising the upper bound for $|\widehat{T}_1(m)|$:
$$|\widehat{T}_1(m)| \le \frac{1}{L+1} + \frac{|\sin \pi \ell m|}{\pi m} \le \frac{1}{L+1} + \ell. \qquad \square$$

Now let ℓ be the least integer with

$$\log(\varepsilon\gamma\ell) \ge \frac{2t-2}{0.90411\left(\frac{2}{7} - \varepsilon\right)} + C_1, \tag{3.3}$$

and let $L = 2(\ell - 1)r + 1$. As above, select primes $q'_1, \ldots, q'_\ell$ from $q_1, \ldots, q_L$ so that (3.2) holds. Applying Lemma 1, choose $h'_1, \ldots, h'_k$ from $\{Pq'_1, \ldots, Pq'_\ell\}$ so that, for some real η,

$$-\gamma h'_m \in (\eta, \eta + \varepsilon\gamma) \pmod 1 \quad (m = 1, \ldots, k)$$

and

$$k \ge \varepsilon\gamma\ell. \tag{3.4}$$

We combine (3.3), (3.4) with (1.12) to obtain (iii). Now there is a bounded h, $h \equiv 0 \pmod{P}$, with

$$\gamma h \in (\eta - \varepsilon\gamma, \eta) \pmod{1}.$$

This follows from Lemma 1 with $x_j = jP\gamma$, since

$$\sum_{j=1}^{J} e(mjP\gamma) \ll \frac{1}{\|mP\gamma\|}.$$

We now have (i), (ii) and (iii). Theorem 1 yields the required set of primes $\mathcal{S}$ with

$$D(\mathcal{S}) \le P(q_L - q_1) \ll \exp(O(\ell r)),$$

and the desired bound (1.13) follows from the choice of ℓ. This completes the proof of Theorem 2.

4. Lemmas for the proof of Theorem 4

We begin by extending a theorem of Robert and Sargos [10] (essentially, their result is the case $Q = 1$ of Lemma 2).

Lemma 2. *Let $H \ge 1$, $N \ge 1$, $M \ge 1$, $Q \ge 1$, $X \gg HN$. For $H < h \le 2H$, $N < n \le 2N$, $M < m \le 2M$ and the characters $\chi \pmod{q}$, $1 \le q \le Q$, let $a(h,n,q,\chi)$ and $b(m)$ be complex numbers,*

$$|a(h,n,q,\chi)| \le 1, \quad |b(m)| \le 1.$$

Let α, β, γ be fixed real numbers, $\alpha(\alpha-1)\beta\gamma \ne 0$. Let

$$S_0(\chi) = \sum_{H<h\le 2H} \sum_{N<n\le 2N} a(h,n,q,\chi) \sum_{M<m\le 2M} b(m)\chi(m) e\left(\frac{Xh^\beta n^\gamma m^\alpha}{H^\beta N^\gamma M^\alpha}\right).$$

Then

$$\sum_{q\le Q} \sum_{\chi \pmod{q}} |S_0(\chi)| \ll (HMN)^\varepsilon \left(Q^2 HNM^{\frac12} + Q^{3/2} HNM \left(\frac{X^{\frac14}}{(HN)^{\frac14} M^{\frac12}} + \frac{1}{(HN)^{\frac14}}\right)\right).$$

Proof. By Cauchy's inequality,

$$|S_0(\chi)|^2 \le HN \sum_{H<h\le 2H} \sum_{N<n\le 2N} \sum_{\substack{M<m_1\le 2M \\ M<m_2\le 2M}} b(m_1)\overline{b(m_2)}\chi(m_1)\overline{\chi(m_2)} e(Xu(h,n)v(m_1,m_2)),$$

with

$$u(h,n) = \frac{h^\beta n^\gamma}{H^\beta N^\gamma}, \quad v(m_1,m_2) = \frac{m_1^\alpha - m_2^\alpha}{M^\alpha}.$$

Summing over χ,

$$\sum_{\chi \pmod{q}} |S_0(\chi)|^2 \le HN \sum_{H<h\le 2H} \sum_{N<n\le 2N} \phi(q) \sum_{\substack{M<m_1\le 2M \\ M<m_2\le 2M \\ m_1 \equiv m_2 \pmod{q}}} b(m_1)\overline{b(m_2)} e(Xu(h,n)v(m_1,m_2)).$$

Separating the contribution from $m_1 = m_2$, and summing over q,

$$\sum_{q\le Q}\ \sum_{\chi \,(\mathrm{mod}\, q)} |S_0(\chi)|^2 \le H^2N^2M \sum_{q\le Q}\phi(q) + S_1,$$

where

$$S_1 = C(\varepsilon)M^\varepsilon QHN \sum_{H<h\le 2H}\ \sum_{N<n\le 2N}\ \sum_{\substack{M<m_1\le 2M\\ M<m_2\le 2M}} w(m_1,m_2)e(Xu(h,n)v(m_1,m_2)),$$

with

$$w(m_1,m_2) = \begin{cases} 0 & \text{if } m_1 = m_2,\\ \displaystyle\sum_{q\le Q}\ \sum_{m_1-m_2=qn,\, n\in\mathbb{Z}} \frac{b(m_1)\overline{b(m_2)}\phi(q)}{C(\varepsilon)M^\varepsilon Q} & \text{if } m_1 \ne m_2. \end{cases}$$

Note that

$$|w(m_1,m_2)| \le 1$$

for all m_1, m_2 if $C(\varepsilon)$ is suitably chosen.

We now apply the double large sieve to S_1 exactly as in [10, (6.5)]. Using the upper bounds given in [10], we have

$$S_1 \ll M^\varepsilon QHNX^{1/2}\mathcal{B}_1^{1/2}\mathcal{B}_2^{1/2},$$

where

$$\mathcal{B}_1 = \sum_{\substack{h_1,n_1,h_2,n_2\\ |u(h_1,n_1)-u(h_2,n_2)|\le 1/X\\ H<h_i\le 2H,\, N<n_i\le 2N\ (i=1,2)}} 1 \ll (HN)^{2+\varepsilon}\left(\frac{1}{HN}+\frac{1}{X}\right)$$

$$\ll (HN)^{1+\varepsilon},$$

and

$$\mathcal{B}_2 = \sum_{\substack{m_1,m_2,m_3,m_4\\ |v(m_1,m_2)-v(m_3,m_4)|\le 1/X\\ M<m_i\le 2M\ (1\le i\le 4)}} 1 \ll M^{4+\varepsilon}\left(\frac{1}{M^2}+\frac{1}{X}\right).$$

Hence

$$\sum_{q\le Q}\ \sum_{\chi\,(\mathrm{mod}\, q)} |S_0(\chi)|^2 \ll Q^2H^2N^2M + (MHN)^{2+2\varepsilon}Q\left(\frac{X^{1/2}}{(HNM^2)^{1/2}} + \frac{1}{(HN)^{1/2}}\right).$$

Lemma 2 follows on an application of Cauchy's inequality. □

Lemma 3. *Fix c, $0<c<1$. Let $h\ge 1$, $m \ge 1$, $K>1$, $K'\le 2K$,*

$$S = \sum_{K<k\le K',\, mk\equiv u \pmod q} e(h(mk)^c).$$

Then for any q, u,

$$S \ll (hm^cK^c)^{1/2} + K(hm^cK^c)^{-1/2}.$$

Proof. We write S in the form

$$S = \frac{1}{q}\sum_{K<k\le K'}\sum_{r=1}^{q} e\left(\frac{r(mk-u)}{q} + h(mk)^c\right)$$
$$= \frac{1}{q}\sum_{r=1}^{q} e\left(-\frac{ur}{q}\right)\sum_{K<k\le K'} e\left(\frac{rmk}{q} + h(mk)^c\right),$$

and apply [4, Theorem 2.2] to each sum over k. $\square$

5. Proof of Theorem 4

Throughout this section, fix $c \in \left(\frac{8}{9}, 1\right)$ and define, for an interval I of length $|I| < 1$,

$$\mathcal{A}(I) = \{n \in [N, 2N) : n^c \in I \pmod 1\}.$$

We choose $\mathcal{H}_k$ compatible with $\mathcal{R}$ as in the proof of Theorem 3, so that

$$h_k - h_1 \ll \exp(O(kr)).$$

We apply the second assertion of Theorem 1 with

$$M = N, \quad Y = N^{c+\varepsilon}, \quad b = 1, \quad \rho(n) = X(\mathbb{P}; n).$$

We define θ by

$$\theta = \frac{9c-8}{6} - \varepsilon,$$

and we choose $k = \lceil \exp(\frac{2t-2}{\theta} + C_1)\rceil$, so that (1.10) holds. By our choice of θ, the range in (1.11) is contained in

$$1 \le d \le N^{2-2c}. \tag{5.1}$$

It remains to verify (1.5) and (1.9) for a fixed h_m. We consider (1.9) first.

The set $(\mathcal{A} + h_m) \cap \mathcal{A}$ consists of those n in $[N, 2N)$ with

$$n^c - \beta \in [0, N^{-1+c+\varepsilon}) \ (\mathrm{mod}\, 1), \ (n+h_m)^c - \beta \in [0, N^{-1+c+\varepsilon}) \ (\mathrm{mod}\, 1).$$

Since

$$(n + h_m)^c = n^c + O(N^{c-1}) \quad (N \le n < 2N),$$

we have

$$\mathcal{A}(I_2) \subset (\mathcal{A} + h_m) \cap \mathcal{A} \subset \mathcal{A}(I_1) \tag{5.2}$$

where, for a given A,

$$I_1 = [\beta, \beta + N^{-1+c+\varepsilon}),$$
$$I_2 = [\beta, \beta + N^{-1+c+\varepsilon}\,(1 - \mathcal{L}^{-A-3k})).$$

By a standard partial summation argument it will suffice to show that, for any choice of u_q relatively prime to q,

$$\sum_{q\le N^\theta} \mu^2(q)\tau_{3k}(q)\left|\sum_{\substack{n\,\equiv\, u_q \pmod q\\ N\le n<N'}}\left(\Lambda(n)X((\mathcal{A}+h_m)\cap\mathcal{A}; n) - N^{-1+c+\varepsilon}\frac{q}{\phi(q)}\right)\right| \ll Y\mathcal{L}^{-A}$$

for $N' \in [N, 2N)$. (The implied constant here and below may depend on A.) In view of (5.2), we need only show that for any $A > 0$,

(5.3)
$$\sum_{q \le N^\theta} \mu^2(q)\tau_{3k}(q) \left| \sum_{\substack{n \equiv u_q \pmod q \\ N \le n < N'}} \left(\Lambda(n) X(\mathcal{A}(I_j); n) - N^{-1+c+\varepsilon} \frac{q}{\phi(q)} \right) \right| \ll Y\mathcal{L}^{-A} \ (j = 1, 2).$$

The sum in (5.3) is bounded by $\sum_1 + \sum_2$, where

$$\sum\nolimits_1 = \sum_{q \le N^\theta} \mu^2(q)\tau_{3k}(q) \left| \sum_{\substack{n \equiv u_q \pmod q \\ n^c \in I_j \pmod 1 \\ N \le n < N'}} \Lambda(n) - N^{-1+c+\varepsilon} \sum_{\substack{n \equiv u_q \pmod q \\ N \le n < N'}} \Lambda(n) \right|$$

and

$$\sum\nolimits_2 = N^{-1+c+\varepsilon} \sum_{q \le N^\theta} \mu^2(q)\tau_{3k}(q) \left| \sum_{\substack{n \equiv u_q \pmod q \\ N \le n < N'}} \left(\Lambda(n) - \frac{q}{\phi(q)} \right) \right|.$$

Deploying the Cauchy-Schwarz inequality in the same way as in [6, (5.20)], it follows from the Bombieri-Vinogradov theorem that

$$\sum\nolimits_2 \ll N^{c+\varepsilon}\mathcal{L}^{-A}.$$

Moreover,

$$\sum_{q \le N^\theta} \mu^2(q)\tau_{3k}(q) \left| N^{-1+c+\varepsilon} \sum_{\substack{n \equiv u_q \pmod q \\ N \le n < N'}} \Lambda(n) - |I_j| \sum_{\substack{n \equiv u_q \pmod q \\ N \le n < N'}} \Lambda(n) \right| \ll N^{c+\varepsilon}\mathcal{L}^{-A}$$

(trivially for $j = 1$, and by the Brun-Titchmarsh inequality for $j = 2$). Thus it remains to show that

$$\sum_{q \le N^\theta} \mu^2(q)\tau_{3k}(q) \left| \sum_{\substack{n \equiv u_q \pmod q \\ n^c \in I_j \pmod 1 \\ N \le n < N'}} \Lambda(n) - |I_j| \sum_{\substack{n \equiv u_q \pmod q \\ N \le n < N'}} \Lambda(n) \right| \ll N^{c+\varepsilon}\mathcal{L}^{-A}.$$

Let $H = N^{1-c-\varepsilon}\mathcal{L}^{A+3k}$. We apply Lemma 1, with $a_j = \Lambda(N + j - 1)$ for $N + j - 1 \equiv u_q \pmod q$ and $a_j = 0$ otherwise, and $L = H$. Using the Brun-Titchmarsh inequality, we find that

$$\left| \sum_{\substack{n \equiv u_q \pmod q \\ n^c \in I_j \pmod 1 \\ N \le n < N'}} \Lambda(n) - |I_j| \sum_{\substack{n \equiv u_q \pmod q \\ N \le n < N'}} \Lambda(n) \right|$$
$$\ll \frac{N^{c+\varepsilon}}{\phi(q)}\mathcal{L}^{-A-3k} + N^{-1+c+\varepsilon} \sum_{1 \le h \le H} \left| \sum_{\substack{N \le n < N' \\ n \equiv u_q \pmod q}} \Lambda(n) e(hn^c) \right|.$$

Recalling the upper estimate $\tau_{3k}(q) \ll N^{\varepsilon/20}$ for $q \le N^\theta$, it suffices to show that

$$\sum_{q \le N^\theta} \sum_{1 \le h \le H} \sigma_{q,h} \sum_{\substack{N \le n < N' \\ n \equiv u_q \pmod q}} \Lambda(n) e(hn^c) \ll N^{1-\varepsilon/10}$$

for complex numbers $\sigma_{q,h}$ with $|\sigma_{q,h}| \le 1$.

We apply a standard dyadic dissection argument, finding that it suffices to show that

$$\sum_{q \le N^\theta} \sum_{H_1 \le h \le 2H_1} \sigma_{q,h} \sum_{\substack{N \le n < N' \\ n \equiv u_q \,(\mathrm{mod}\, q)}} \Lambda(n) e(hn^c) \ll N^{1-\varepsilon/9} \tag{5.4}$$

for $1 \le H_1 \le H$. The next step is a standard decomposition of the von Mangoldt function; see for example [3, Section 24]. In order to obtain (5.4), it suffices to show that

$$\sum_{q \le N^\theta} \sum_{H_1 \le h \le 2H_1} \sigma_{q,h} \sum_{M \le m < 2M} \sum_{\substack{K \le k < 2K \\ N \le mk < N' \\ mk \equiv u_q \,(\mathrm{mod}\, q)}} a_m b_k e(h(mk)^c) \ll N^{1-\varepsilon/8} \tag{5.5}$$

for complex numbers a_m, b_k with $|a_m| \le 1, |b_k| \le 1$, subject to *either*

$$N^{1/2} \ll K \ll N^{2/3} \tag{5.6}$$

or

$$K \gg N^{2/3}, \quad b_k = \begin{cases} 1 & \text{if } K \le k < K', \\ 0 & \text{if } K' \le k < 2K. \end{cases} \tag{5.7}$$

We first obtain (5.5) under the condition (5.6). We replace (5.5) by

$$\sum_{q \le N^\theta} \frac{1}{\phi(q)} \sum_{\chi \,(\mathrm{mod}\, q)} \overline{\chi}(u_q) \sum_{H_1 \le h_1 \le 2H_1} \sigma_{q,h} \sum_{M \le m < 2M} \sum_{\substack{K \le k < 2K \\ N \le mk < N'}} a_m b_k \chi(m) \chi(k) e(h(mk)^c) \ll N^{1-\varepsilon/8}.$$

A further dyadic dissection argument reduces our task to showing that

$$\sum_{Q \le q \le 2Q} \sum_{\chi \,(\mathrm{mod}\, q)} \left| \sum_{H_1 \le h \le 2H_1} \sigma_{q,h} \sum_{M \le m < 2M} \sum_{K \le k < 2K} a_m b_k \chi(m) \chi(k) e(h(mk)^c) \right| \ll QN^{1-\varepsilon/7} \tag{5.8}$$

for $Q < N^\theta$.

We now apply Lemma 2 with $X = H_1 N^c$ and (H_1, K, M) in place of (H, N, M). The condition $X \gg H_1 K$ follows easily since $K \ll N^c$. Thus the left-hand side of (5.8) is

$$\begin{aligned} &\ll (H_1 N)^{\varepsilon/8} (Q^2 H_1 N^{1/2} K^{1/2} + Q^{3/2} H_1 N^{\frac{1}{2} + \frac{c}{4}} K^{1/4} + Q^{3/2} H_1^{3/4} N K^{-1/4}) \\ &\ll N^{\varepsilon/7} (Q^2 H_1 N^{5/6} + Q^{3/2} H_1 N^{2/3 + c/4} + Q^{3/2} H_1^{3/4} N^{7/8}) \end{aligned}$$

using (5.6). Each term in the last expression is $\ll QN^{1-\varepsilon/7}$:

$$\begin{aligned} N^{\varepsilon/7} Q^2 H_1 N^{5/6} (QN^{1-\varepsilon/7})^{-1} &\ll N^{\theta + 5/6 - c + 2\varepsilon/7} \ll 1, \\ N^{\varepsilon/7} Q^{3/2} H_1 N^{2/3 + c/4} (QN^{1-\varepsilon/7})^{-1} &\ll N^{\theta/2 + 2/3 - 3c/4 + 2\varepsilon/7} \ll 1, \\ N^{\varepsilon/7} Q^{3/2} H_1^{3/4} N^{7/8} (QN^{1-\varepsilon/7})^{-1} &\ll N^{\theta/2 + 5/8 - 3c/4 + 2\varepsilon/7} \ll 1. \end{aligned}$$

We now obtain (5.5) under the condition (5.7). By Lemma 3, the left-hand side of (5.5) is

$$\ll N^{\theta} M H_1((H_1N^c)^{1/2} + K(H_1N^c)^{-1/2})$$

$$\ll H_1^{3/2} N^{1+c/2+\theta} K^{-1} + H_1^{1/2} N^{1-c/2+\theta}$$

$$\ll N^{11/6-c+\theta} + N^{3/2-c+\theta} \ll N^{1-\varepsilon/8}.$$

Turning to (1.5), (under the condition (1.11) on d) by a similar argument to that leading to (5.5), it suffices to show that

$$\sum_{\substack{q\le N^{\theta}\\ (q,d)=1}} \sum_{H_1\le h\le 2H_1} \Bigg| \sum_{\substack{N\le n\le N'\\ n\equiv u_{qd} \,(\mathrm{mod}\, qd)}} e(hn^c) \Bigg| \ll N^{1-\varepsilon/3} d^{-1} \tag{5.9}$$

for $d \le N^{2-2c}$, $H_1 \le N^{1-c}$, $N \le N' \le 2N$. By Lemma 3, the left-hand side of (5.9) is

$$\ll N^{\theta} H_1((H_1N^c)^{1/2} + N(H_1N^c)^{-1/2}).$$

Each of the two terms here is $\ll N^{1-\varepsilon/3}d^{-1}$. To see this,

$$N^{\theta} H_1^{3/2} N^{c/2} (N^{1-\varepsilon/3} d^{-1})^{-1} \ll N^{\theta+1/2-c} N^{2-2c} \ll 1$$

and

$$N^{\theta} H_1^{1/2} N^{1-c/2} (N^{1-\varepsilon/3} d^{-1})^{-1} \ll N^{\theta+1/2-c} N^{2-2c} \ll 1.$$

This completes the proof of Theorem 4. ☐

Acknowledgments. The second author is supported by NSF award DMS-1402268. This work began while the second author was visiting BYU. He thanks the BYU mathematics department for their hospitality.

References

[1] R. C. Baker, *Diophantine Inequalities*, London Mathematical Society Monographs, New Series, vol. 1, Oxford University Press, Oxford, 1986.

[2] R. C. Baker and L. Zhao, *Gaps between primes in Beatty Sequences*, preprint, `arXiv: 1411.2898v1`.

[3] H. Davenport, *Multiplicative number theory*, third edition, Graduate Texts in Mathematics, 74. Springer-Verlag, New York 2000.

[4] S. W. Graham and G. Kolesnik, *Van der Corput's Method of Exponential Sums*, London Mathematical Society Lecture Note Series, 126. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge 1991.

[5] G. Harman, *Prime-detecting Sieves*, Princeton Univ. Press, Princeton, NJ, 2007.

[6] J. Maynard, *Small gaps between primes*, Ann. of Math. (2) **181** (2015), 383–413.

[7] P. Pollack, *Bounded gaps between primes with a given primitive root*, Algebra Number Theory **8** (2014), 1769–1786.

[8] P. Pollack and L. Thompson, *Arithmetic functions at consecutive shifted primes*, Int. J. Number Theory (to appear), `arXiv: 1405.4444`.

[9] D. H. J. Polymath, *Variants of the Selberg sieve, and bounded intervals containing many primes*, Research Mathematical Sciences 2014, **1**:12.

[10] O. Robert and P. Sargos, *Three-dimensional exponential sums with monomials*, J. Reine Angew. Math. **591** (2006), 1–20.

[11] N. M. Timofeev, *Distribution of arithmetic functions in short intervals in the mean with respect to progressions.* Izv. Akad. Nauk SSSR Ser. Mat. **51** (1987), 341–362.